DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 021 UD 010 922

TITLE	Educational Leadership Training Program for Majority-Negro Rural-Isolated School Districts in North Carolina, 1969-70. Final Technical Report.
INSTITUTION	Saint Augustine's Coll., Raleigh, N.C.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	36p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Faculty Integration, Integration Methods, Negro Teachers, Program Evaluation, *Race Relations, *Rural Education, Rural School Systems, *School Integration, *Summer Institutes
IDENTIFIERS	North Carolina, Raleigh, Saint Augustine College

ABSTRACT

This is the concluding report of the operational phase of a summer institute conducted by Saint Augustine's College at North Carolina State University for the Eastern North Carolina Teachers' follow-up activities and evaluation. The project focused on the need for raising the level of professional competence of school personnel in predominantly black, rural school districts, with the hope that the quality of education would be improved and desegregation facilitated. In addition, improvement of race relations was a specific objective. The summer institute program included lectures and seminars. The program was evaluated by pretest-posttest measures; the data show that the institute was effective in bringing about and maintaining positive attitudes towards integration for the total group of participants. (Author/JW)

ED047021

Final Technical Report

of the

Educational Leadership Training Program

For Majority-Negro Rural-Isolated School

Districts in North Carolina, 1969-70

Submitted by the

Educational Leadership and Human Relations Center

of North Carolina

UD010922

Saint Augustine's College

Raleigh, North Carolina

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Final Technical Report

This is the concluding report of the operational phrase of the four-week summer institute that was conducted by Saint Augustine's College on campus at the North Caroina State University for the Eastern North Carolina Teachers the follow-up activities and evaluation. The project addressed itself to the need for raising the level of professional competence of school personnel in Majority-Negro, Rural Isolated School Districts in order that the quality of education could be upgraded, the quality of educational opportunity could be improved, and the desegregation of schools be facilitated. Specific objectives were:

1. To develop better attitudes toward members of other races.
2. To develop better attitudes towards the process of school desegregation.
3. To develop better understanding of children and how they learn.
4. To develop better understanding of modern instructional organizations and techniques.
5. To develop greater willingness to become involved in the improvement of the educational process.
6. To develop action programs designed to close the gap between Negro and White and rural and urban children.
7. To develop skills and abilities that would help compensate for deprivation among rural isolated children and to reduce drop-out rates.

The Institute as originally designed was to serve the following purposes:

1. Furthering professional development of approximately 25 school personnel from each of ten Majority Negro Rural Isolated School Districts in the two states.
2. Improving the professional competence of school personnel involved.
3. Preparing these 250 persons to aid in conducting in-service programs in their districts.
4. Preparing other participants to become effective leaders in their several school districts and to become better able to interperet the problems and programs of the school district they represented. Specifically the program called for the raising the quality of education in these districts through:

    a. Instruction and activities designed to improve human relations in the school divisions.
    b. Instruction for participants in four academic areas: language arts, mathematics, science, and the social sciences.

c. Sessions in which participants could work with experts in planning action programs for the coming year.
d. Development of leadership skills among participants.

The training program was designed in three separate Phases:

1. A planning phase.
2. An operational phase during the summer of 1969: July 21 - August 15.
3. A follow-up and evaluation phase between the summer of 1969 and June 15, of 1970.

Planning of the training program began during the winter of 1968 under the direction of the Educational Leadership and Human Relations Center at Saint Augustine's College in North Carolina and the Consultative Resource Center for School Desegregation at the University of Virginia. The directors of these two Title IV Centers came together to plan a joint proposal and program for achieving the above goals. A preliminary proposal was written for obtaining an Education Professions Development Act grant to finance the instructional phase of the Leadership program. Tentative approval was given and a request was then made that the proposal be developed more fully.

Directors were chosen for the two state Leadership programs: Dr. Willard S. Swiers, Professor of Education at Campbell College in North Carolina for the North Carolina program, and Dr. William Sartain, Professor of Sociology at the University of Virginia for the Virginia program. These two directors met with each others personnel who would be involved in the program in various meetings for planning the Institute. These meetings occured in Virginia, in North Carolina, in Washington, D. C., and in Atlanta, Georgia. Originally the programs in the two states were designed to resemble each other closely. However, facilities were not available at

a central location in Virginia that could be used for the summer program, so a change was made there. The Virginia Institute during the summer of 1969 was actually a series of two and three week programs held in various school districts. A report of those activities will follow this preliminary report.

North Carolina's Summer Program was held on the campus of North Carolina State University and this report will deal primarily with this operation. The Leadership Training Program was funded from four separate sources:

1. Instructional costs were covered by an Educational Professions Development Grant.
2. Many of the participants' stipends were paid from funds made available under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act.
3. Some of the participants' stipends were paid from and other expenditures covered through the Educational Leadership and Human Relations Center at Saint Augustine's College under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act.
4. Some local School funds were used to make participation in the project possible.

Because of problems involved in getting Title I money for covering participants' stipends, the original goal of having 25 participants from each of ten systems was not met. However, in North Carolina 251 persons from 17 school districts originally enrolled for the summer program. One school system from Tennessee, the Fayette County system, and the Jasper City school system from Florida also had participants. More than 250 persons were involved in the summer program as participants during the session.

Administrative personnel from some school systems rearranged their staff schedules for the four week period so that supervisors, principals, and assistants who could attend for one or two weeks alternated with others who would have the other weeks free to attend. A number of superintendents and principals came in for

one or two days of the program. Ten group leaders were employed in the instructional program to work with participants. These group leaders were individuals who might ordinarily have been included as participants but who had been identified as having capabilities of becoming good group leaders. The staff of the North Carolina institute included a Project Director, an Associate Project Director, an Instructor, ten consultants, and the ten group leaders. The consultants were experts in various teaching areas that ranged from social studies on the elementary level to mathematics on the secondary level, to guidance to school administration. Eight of these experts worked threeeweeks during the summer program; the other two worked only two weeks.

Of those originally enrolled for the summer program in North Carolina, the ratio of black to white among participants was 2 to 1. The ratio of female to male was 2 to 1. The ratio of elementary to secondary to administrator was 11 to 10 to 3. Overall, 17 school districts were included. Each of the morning discussion groups was designed to be a miniature of the entire institute. That is, 2 to 1 black to white; 2 to 1 female to male; 11 to 10 to 3 elementary to secondary to administrator, and each group had no fewer than 13 of the systems represented in it. In no group were administrators assigned to work with teachers from their own school.

Each day began with an input speaker who provided fresh insight into some of the problems that exist in rural-isolated, majority-Negro school districts. After a question and answer period with the speaker, participants were given a 30 minute break, which provided an informal human interaction session, after which they reconvened for small group discussions. Following lunch, participants were divided

into groups again for input sessions related to curriculum, to upgrading teaching abilities, and to gaining new knowledge about their teaching fields. Participants were grouped according to subject matter specialities for the afternoon sessions.

For the first week administrators who were attending the institute were assigned to groups with the teachers during the afternoon. Each administrator received two days experience with elementary teachers and two days with secondary teachers. During the second and third week the administrators were placed into special groups and were involved for one week of afternoon work with an expert in guidance and a second week of afternoon work with an expert on problems related to administration of schools. During afternoons of the fourth week participants were re grouped again according to the school system in which they worked. They began preparing plans of action for the coming school year. Each unit developed such a plan that was written and submitted to the institute staff. On Thursday or Friday of each week an evaluation form was submitted to the participants designed to help them relate information to the staff that might improve the overall Institute. Their comments, suggestions, and questions were taken into account them for any further planning of the next week's program that might be needed. During the afternoon sessions and in some of the morning sessions field trips were taken to various facilities throughout the metropolitian area of Raleigh, North Carolina that might enhance learning. Additional resource people were secured and brought into the group sessions both morning and afternoons.

After the first week a number of the groups used role playing techniques for unveiling some of the problems that might exist in their school districts.

Several weaknesses in the program for leadership training were exposed as the summer program developed. Although the director, the associate director, and the instructor had worked together preparing for the summer program, due to time limitations very little planning was done with other staff members (that is, group leaders and consultants). A one day planning session was held before the institute was opened. but as the summer passed it became obvious that this had not been nearly enough. Staff meetings were held regularly throughout the four week program as a way of compensating for this inadequacy. Although many of the participants appeared to have some leadership ability, selections had not been as carefully made as they could have been with more time. The staff was especially concerned that almost no white participants came from several of the school districts. Some, for example, had ratios of 1 white to 12 black, or even 1 white to 15 black.

Another weakness in the selection of participants was that, in many instances, they came from large school systems and did not know each other prior to arrival at the summer program and would not be working together afterward. The staff had requested of a school system that teams of people from a small number of schools. During the last week of the summer program when teams were working together from individual school systems effort seemed to be dissipated because of the geographical problem involved in a large county when participants would try to plan how they might follow up the summer's activities.

Special effort was made to get superintendents from the systems to attend the institute. No superintendent was able to attend for the entire four week period and some did not attend at all. However, on the afternoon of the day that Dr. Lily-white from the Elementary and Secondary Act Program came approximately ten superin-

tendents did come to Raleigh and attended the institute that day. Some brought additional principals and other supervisory and administrative staff members with them. Other superintendents attended the institute during the last week especially in the afternoons when their people were planning action programs for the coming school year.

Most of the emphasis in human relations during the program was placed on Black and white differences, similarities and problems. In North Carolina however, a third racial group is involved, Indians. Although only one Indian was included as a participant in the Institute, many of the participants work regularly with Indian children in their classrooms.

Part of the first day of the summer program was devoted to evaluation in the form of pre-testing. An evaluation instrument had been designed for use in the Institute by a staff member of the Research Center at North Carolina State University. The instrument requires approximately one hour for a participant to take and the instrument had been developed in accordance with the objectives stated for the Leadership Training Program. The instrument was again administered to the participants, and again to approximately seventy per cent of the participants ten months later, May 1, 1970. The report of Research Analyst of the pre and post-test and the follow-up test are included as a part of this report.

A weakness of the summer program as identified by many of the participants involved social activities: due to time limitations and other pressing matters that needed attention the staff had not definitely planned any social activities in advance. One picnic was held at a nearby park during an afternoon of the third

week, and on Thursday of the last week a luncheon was held at the Faculty Club of North Carolina State University which all participants attended. Since many of the participants were staying in dormitories and other participants were commuting each day, planning of social activities was difficult.

Part of the arrangement between the training program and the North Carolina State University involved participants being able to receive six hours of graduate credit from that institution. Although formal reading and research assignments were not given, the library of North Carolina State was made available to participants and the institute staff had assembled a wide variety of reading materials for use in the institute. In addition, many mimeographed handouts were made available as well as other reprints of materials that had been found to be useful for working in the area of human relations. Newly produced teaching materials were also made available by various commercial firms: records, slides, tapes, flat pictures, and movies were used in the small groups.

If a similar program is planned for other years certain modifications might be suggested for the way in which it could be operated. Definite project approval needs to be given earlier in order that planning can be more concrete and commitment more definite. Better selection of participants could thereby occur although the administrative staff of the summer program felt that the instructional staff and the group leaders did an excellent job. If selection of staff could be made earlier in the year some weaknesses might be corrected in this way. If the program were to be developed for another year, more emphasis should be placed on the value of role playing, psycho-dramatics, and other related learning techniques. A larger number of whites would have enhanced the Institute for the summer. Participants were given

ample opportunity and encouraged to rate each of the staff members and each of the lecturers and consultants who were brought in for the morning input sessions. The Staff has been able to learn from these evaluations who the people were who were most effective in achieving the objectives of the institute. For a future year some change may be made in choosing input speakers and staff members.

During the two week interim between conclusion of the summer institute and the opening of school the Associate Director visited and worked in five of the school systems that participated in the training program. Plans that were developed during the last week of the summer institute were already being implemented in each of these school systems.

Example 1. Jones County, North Carolina. Participants planned a three day in-service program for the entire school system modeled after the workshops sponsored by the Educational Leadership and Human Relations Center in Raleigh. The participants became group discussion leaders; they requested and were able to obtain services of two of the morning input speakers from the summer program; they elicited complete cooperation of the administrative staff of the school system; and they implemented this phase of their planning successfully. The third session occurred on September 20, 1969.

Example 2. Hertford County, North Carolina. Participants obtained permission to form a Human Relations Council in the school system. On the morning of the first orientation day they administered a brief attitude scale to the entire professional staff of the system. The superintendent agreed to have the Human Relations Council conduct part of the day's program. They chose to have the Associate Director for the Summer Institute talk to the school staff on "Professionalism and

School Desegregation."

Example 3. Gates County, North Carolina. The superintendent of this system has cooperated closely with the staff members who participated in the summer program. A seven day desegregation institute was developed for 30 teachers in the district, and all of the school personnel attended the last two days. The superintendent is developing plans with the participants for an in-service workshop in human relations for the coming year.

Example 4. Pamlico County, North Carolina. Participants were instrumental in conducting a human relations workshop for the school system during the week immediately following the summer program. In addition to input speakers and group discussions, sessions were held with student leaders designed to avert problems related to student activities.

Reproductions of three of the action plans devised by participants in the institute are attached to this report.

At the conclusion of the summer program an "open ended sentence" evaluation form was completed by each of the participants. Based on an analysis of 60 per cent of these questionnaires the following reactions to the program can be stated:

1. The highlights of the program most frequently mentioned were:
    a. the high quality of the morning input sessions;
    b. the open discussions and free exchange of ideas in the group sessions;
    c. The quality of human relations that developed among staff and participants;
    d. the understandings about race that developed.

2. The most irritating aspects of the program were:

   a. uncomfortable and non-airconditioned rooms and (for the first two days) the main auditorium;

   b. the distances involved in walking to classrooms;

   c. parking facilities;

   d. noise in the dormitory.

3. The "areas" in which participants reported gaining the greatest insights were:

   a. race relations, especially as related to teaching and learning;

   b. integration problems that may be encountered but which can be averted:

   c. one's own feelings and beliefs and the need to be considerate of other persons.

4. The most startling event that took place during the summer session was listed as the "real changes" that took place in the attitudes of the whites and blacks.

5. The main concerns that participants had about returning to their schools and communities were:

   a. meeting the needs of students in desegregated classrooms;

   b. how to get the human relations "message" across in school and community;

   c. achieving good communication with parents across racial lines.

6. Participants indicated that as a result of the summer program they personally could best involve themselves in the following:

   a. setting behavioral examples to influence others and to promote human relations and understandings;

   b. helping to improve school - community relations;

c. helping to facilitate communication within the school;

d. planning in-service programs in human relations.

7. The participants recommended that another training institute definitely be planned and that:

a. more upper level administrators from the school systems be involved;

b. more emphasis be placed on teaching techniques;

c. more whites attend;

d. the same basic format be followed;

e. more social activities be planned to provide informal human interaction;

f. parents, students, and community leaders be involved.

Participants were also asked to evaluate how well they perceived that the objectives of the summer program had been achieved. Analysis of 197 of the responses revealed the following reactions:

	Not achieved	Achieved to some extent	Achieved well
Objective I	0	86	111
Objective II	1	89	108
Objective III	0	71	126
Objective IV	7	110	79
Objective V	1	67	129
Objective VI	11	111	75
Objective VII	11	119	67

One conversation perhaps tells as well as any other form of evaluation some

of the results of the summer program. A white participant had been pointed out early in the summer to the Associate Director as being "a hard core racist." Other participants commented often about the person's belligerent and hostile attitude. During the last evening of the program the Associate Director was visiting in the dormitory when that particular participant came over and said to him: "Dr. Glatt, I can't explain it, but somehow this institute has gotten to me. Last Friday afternoon I drove home for the weekend. I stopped in a country store to get a Coke. An old Negro tobacco field hand was in the store and a white lady was waiting on him. When I walked in she stopped what she was doing, came over to me, and asked: 'May I help you?' I have had that happen a thousand times and had never thought about it at all. But this time I heard myself telling her: 'After you have finished waiting on the other gentleman, I would like a Coke.' I never thought that any institute could make me that conscious about our treatment of other people!"

As originally conceived the project was to included up to five days for a follow-up training and evaluation session for all participants from North Carolina. Varying circumstances made it necessary to eliminate the five-day follow-up from the project. Through negotiations by Directors of the Human Relations Center and the Summer Institute Director arrangements were made whereby approximately ninety per cent of participants were assembled by individual or combined school units.

At these follow-up conferences the Summer Institute Director and one of the Summer Institute group leaders explored with the participants three areas for evaluative purposes. Three questions were asked:

1. Did attending the Summer Institute help you in the human relations area this year?

2. Did attending the institute help you in your teaching this year?

3. If other institutes are planned on what should the emphasis be placed?

Answers to question number one as they were reflected in discussions were affirmative. Individual situations and experiences by almost all participants and the gist of the comments by both Black and White participants was that as a result of the Institute experience they were more at ease in bi-racial situations and they were less hasty in ascribing behaviors to race.

Almost unanimously the participants gave credit to the Institute for beneficial changes in their teaching. Because a considerable number of the participants were still, during the 1969-70 term, teaching all Black classes they were not able to ascribe benefits in teaching integrated classes.

The answers to question number three fell into two rather distinct patterns. Predominant and of major concern was the wish and/or felt need for help in the instructional area. This was not perculiar to a grade level or subject area but covered all aspects of the teaching learning situation. About as important when looking at future Institutes was the feeling by the participants that experiences such as they had are needed by all teachers and other school personnel. Similarly they indicated the members of the School Board and parents should have some such experience. Tactfully but unmistakenly the participants indicated their feeling that attendance at similar institutes should not be entirely voluntary but rather that participants should be selected and directed to attend.

Finally, and in conclusion it can, it would seem be said that the Summer Institute and subsequent conferences and meetings satisfied the purpose for which the- were carried out. The benefits, though substantial for the individuals privileged to participate, will fade unless local leadership utilizes the experience of the participants and in count with them develops learning experiences of this type for all staff members and the general public.

MAJORITY-NEGRO PARTICIPANTS AS OF JUNE 27, 1969

SYSTEM	BLACK	WHITE	OTHER	TOTAL
Weldon	12	12	1 Filipino	25
Hertford	5	6		11
Gates	12	1		13
Halifax	16	9		25
Nash	13	12		25
Edgecombe	17	1		18
Martin	12	1		13
Edenton/Chowan	10	2		12
Hoke	17	2	1 Indian	20
Bladen	13	12		25
Anson	12	4		16
Maxton	6			6
Granville	3	2		5
Pamilco	4	4		8
Jones	9	1		10
Fayette Tennessee	10	5		15
Jasper Florida	1			1

A Follow-Up Evaluation Of The Summer Program Entitled, "Educational Development Program In Leadership Training For Personnel In Rural-Isolated, Majority Negro School Districts"

The purpose of this report is to present the results of a follow-up evaluation of the summer program entitled, "Educational Development Program in Leadership Training for Personnel in Rural-Isolated, Majority Negro School Districts, held at North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, July 21 through August 15, 1969. The Institute was conducted by the Human Relations Center at Saint Augustine's College, Raleigh, North Carolina. The results of the post-test data collected immediately after the conclusion of the Institute were included in an earlier report. This report compares the pretest scores obtained at the beginning of the Institute (July 21, 1969) with the follow-up test scores obtained approximately ten months later (May, 1970). The principal purpose of this report is to determine whether the changes which took place immediately following the Institute were retained over a period of time. The rationale for having two different analyses was to determine whether the effects of the Institute were permanent. The results of the analysis of the pretest and post-test scores presented in an earlier report demonstrated that significant gains were made on four out of five of the major variables which were used in the evaluation. Any changes which are observed over a period of several months can be used as a basis for demonstrating that the changes have been permanent rather than temporary. Thus, the analysis of pretest and follow-up scores helps to answer the question of how permanent are the changes which were brought about by the Institute.

Subjects

The subjects included in this analysis are the 81 Institute participants for

whom full sets of pretest scores and follow-up scores were available. A comparison of the 81 participants included in this analysis and the 206 participants included in the analysis of pretest-posttest scores suggests that there are no significant differences. For example, the 206 participants included in the pretest-posttest analysis reported earlier had the following pretest scores: Variable 1, 131.76; Variable 2, 91.80; Variable 3, 90.29; Variable 4, 8.40; Variable 5, 7.27. The pretest scores of the 81 participants included in this analysis are as follows: Variable 1, 132.01; Variable 2, 89.85; Variable 3, 90.65; Variable 4, 8.64; Variable 5, 7.25. Although statistical significance tests were not applied to these two samples of participants, there is no logical basis for believing that the 81 participants included in the present report are unrepresentative of the 206 participants who were included in the earlier analysis of pretest-posttest scores.

Procedures

In May, 1970, an effort was made to obtain follow-up test scores on all the participants who attended the Institute in July-August, 1969. It was possible to obtain full sets of test scores on 81 participants. These participants were those who had taken all 5 of the pretests and all 5 of the follow-up tests. The follow-up tests of the 81 participants were scored by hand during the first week of June, 1970. All the follow-up scores were recorded on IBM data sheets which contained the pre-test and post-test data. During the second week of June the data was punched on IBM cards and statistical analyses were completed. The written report of results was completed during the third week in June.

Instruments

The following instruments were used in the evaluation:

Variable 1 - An instrument to measure Attitudes Toward Member of Other Races

Variable 2 - An instrument to measure Attitudes Toward Integration

Variable 3 - An instrument to measure Attitudes Toward Children

Variable 4 - An instrument to measure Knowledge of Curriculum

Variable 5 - An instrument to measure Internal-External Control

Each of the instruments are described in the earlier report of pretest-post-test data.

Analyses

The appropriate analysis to use in this type of "One-Group Pretest-Posttest Design" is the significance of difference between correlated pairs of means, as described by J. P. Guilford in Fundamentals of Statistics in Psychology and Education. The analysis seeks to determine whether there is a significant difference between correlated means obtained from the same test administered to the same group on two occasions. In this analysis, the Pretest scores were compared with the Follow-up scores collected in May, 1970.

Results and Conclusions

The results of the statistical analyses are presented in Tables 1-10. In addition to an analysis of the total group of participants (Table 1), separate analyses were

carried out for each of the various combinations of groups and subgroups: Negores only (Table 2), whites only (Table 3); females only (Table 4), males only (Table 5); Negro females (Table 6); Negro males (Table 7); white females (Table 8); and white males (Table 9). Table 10 summarizes the significant differences found on each variable for each of the subgroups.

Attitudes Toward Other Races. Table 1 shows that there was a very slight increase in mean scores on Attitudes Toward Other Races from July, 1969, to May, 1970. The slight increase was not significant at the .05 level for the total group. An examination of Tables 2-9 reveals that there were no significant increases in attitudes for any of the subgroups. Therefore, it was concluded that no significant gains in Attitudes Toward Other Races were maintained over the period of ten months, although the results of the pretest-posttest analysis reported earlier demonstrated that significant gains were made from July 21, 1969, to August 15, 1969.

Attitudes Toward Integration. Table 1 shows that there was a very significant increase in Attitudes Toward Integration for the total group of participants from July, 1969, to May, 1970. An examination of Tables 2-9 reveals that all of the subgroups made significant increases except the male group (Table 5) and the white male group (Table 9). The male group made increases but they were just short of being significant (the t value obtained was 1.60; the value needed is 1.65). The white males (Table 9) made practically no changes from July, 1969, to May, 1970. Although two subgroups did not make significant changes over the period of ten months, the group of participants as a whole made very significant gains in Attitudes Toward Integration. Therefore, it was concluded that the Institute not

only produced immediate changes in Attitudes Toward Integration (see posttest results reported earlier); the changes that were produced have been retained over a period of ten months.

Attitudes Toward Children. Table 1 shows that there was practically no change in Attitudes Toward Children from July, 1969, to May, 1970, for the total group. Tables 2-9 reveal that the only subgroups to make significant gains was the Negro group (Table 2). Therefore, it was concluded that the Negroes, as a group, made significant gains in Attitudes Toward Children from July, 1969, to May, 1970.

Knowledge of Curriculum. Table 1 shows that the group as a whole made a slight increase in Knowledge of Curriculum from July, 1969, to May, 1970; however, the gain was not significant. The white group (Table 3) and the white male group (Table 9) did make significant gains. Therefore, it was concluded that only the white group and the white male group made significant increase in Knowledge of Curriculum from July, 1969, to May, 1970.

External Control. Table 1 shows that the group of participants as a whole made significant increases in External Control from July, 1969, to May, 1970. The gain was not a large one but it was significant at the .05 level. An examination of Tables 2-9 reveals that the male group, the white female group, and the white male group made significant gains in External Control. The white group, as a whole, made very significant gains on the External Control measure. Therefore, it was concluded that the group of participants as a whole, the white group, the male group, the white female group, and the white male group made significant increases in External Control from July, 1969, to May, 1970.

Summary and Discussion

In this section of the report, the results of the evaluation are summarized and discussed. An effort is made in this section to elaborate on the findings and to speculate somewhat regarding what might account for the results. The discussion which follows represents only one point of view and may differ substantially from the speculation and analysis of another person examining the same set of data. Perhaps the validity of the analysis of the results of this Institute must await the results of subsequent Institutes of this nature.

The statistical analyses revealed that no significant changes occurred from July, 1969, to May, 1970, with respect to Attitudes Toward Other Races, although significant changes had taken place between July, 1969, and August, 1970 (see earlier report). There is a possibility that certain events that have transpired since the completion of the Institute have had the effect of producing a negative effect on participants' attitudes; for example, their work situation may not be conducive to the maintenance of highly positive attitudes toward members of other races. Another explanation is that the participants' test scores at the end of the Institute might not have been an accurate reflection of their real attitudes; they might have rated their attitudes higher than they actually were because they felt the need to show a more positive attitude at the end of the Institute than they did at the beginning. Also, there is the possibility that the other 125 participants who were not tested in the follow-up might have actually had much more positive attitudes in May, 1970, than the 81 participants who were tested; we have no data to substantiate this speculation.

The results of the statistical analyses of both the pretest-posttest data (see earlier report) and the analysis of the follow-up data demonstrated that the participants made significant gains in Attitudes Toward Integration. Perhaps this finding is the most positive outcome of the evaluation. It is particularly significant that the participants made lasting gains on this variable since this was the major goal of the Institute. Apparently, the gains made represent the most permanent changes that took place in the Institute. The organizers of the Institute should be particularly gratified that they were able to bring about such positive changes in the participants' Attitudes Toward Integration. They should be even more pleased that the positive changes in attitudes have been retained over a ten-month period of time. Nevertheless, there is one discouraging finding: the white males did not make lasting changes in their Attitudes Toward Integration. Although the white males did make significant increases in integration attitudes from July to August, 1969 (see earlier report), there was practically no difference between their attitudes in July, 1969, and their attitudes when they were tested again in May, 1970. In spite of this negative finding, it should be pointed out that the white males represent only a fraction of the total group (12 out of 81). Even though the white males did not improve their integration attitudes over the ten-month period, the group of participants as a whole made large enough gains to produce a significant effect. Therefore, the participant gains in Attitudes Toward Integration seem to represent the most positive accomplishment of the Institute.

Changes in Attitudes Toward Children and in Knowledge of Curriculum were not significant for the total group over the period of ten months. Perhaps this can be partly accounted for by the fact that the Institute did not concentrate on bringing

about changes in these two variables. Nevertheless, a positive finding was observed among the Negroes who did make significant gains in Attitudes Toward Children and among the white group and the white male group who made significant increases in Knowledge of Curriculum.

One of the most interesting findings of the evaluation deals with the performance of various groups on External Control. The results of the statistical analyses show that the group as a whole and several of the subgroups made significant gains on External Control. A low score on External Control is interpreted to mean that the individual feels that he has control of his environment; a high score is interpreted as meaning that the individual feels that his behavior is controlled externally; i.e., that he does not have control of the forces which shape his life. The data collected in this evaluation suggests that the participants felt that they had greater control of their environment before the Institute than they did afterwards. However, it is difficult to make a valid evaluation of this finding. Is it contrary to expectation? Or is it consistent with expectation? A close examination of the data suggests an explanation. All of the white groups but none of the Negro groups made significant gains on externality. In other words, the white participants felt they had less control of their fate at the end of the Institute than they did at the beginning of the Institute. The Negroes, as a group, made practically no chages on External Control. An examination of the written responses of white participants on the openended questionnaire indicates that some of them felt like they were being preached to. Now, it might be that they should be preached to, or it might be that they were not preached to, they might have felt guilty or "just thought they were being preached to." Nevertheless, no matter what the reason, the

fact they they reported that they felt like they were preached to may account for the fact that they (whites) had higher External Control scores at the end of the Institute. This is not to say that it is good or bad to have high External Control scores. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with a high score.

In summary, the data shows that the major goal of the Institute was accomplished well. Apparently, the Institute was effective in bringing about and maintaining positive attitudes toward integration for the total group of participants. One of the most positive things that can be said for the organizers of the Institute is that they had the foresight and the insight to build in an evaluation of the Institute. They not only designed a pretest-posttest evaluation; they also included a follow-up. They were not afraid to put their work on the line and to submit their participants to a comprehensive set of evaluation instruments. It is this kind of attitude and approach to evaluation which will enable them to analyze the fruits of their efforts, to become knowledgeable regarding this type of Institute, and to become the architects of model institutes which can be implemented elsewhere.

TABLE I

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t TESTS

OF 5 VARIABLES FOR TOTAL GROUP

VARIABLE	N	JULY, 1969		MAY, 1970		t
		MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	
1. Attitudes Toward Other Races	81	132.01	29.82	132.80	28.56	.21
2. Attitudes Toward Integration	80	89.85	11.91	95.23	14.07	4.30**
3. Attitudes Toward Children	81	90.65	8.39	91.25	7.53	.63
4. Knowledge of Curriculum	81	8.64	2.56	9.01	2.67	1.59
5. External Control	81	7.25	3.61	7.98	3.80	1.95*

* Significant at .05 level (Greater than 1.65)

** Significant at .01 level (Greater than 2.33)

TABLE 2

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t TESTS

OF 5 VARIABLES FOR NEGROES

VARIABLE	N	JULY, 1969		MAY, 1970		t
		MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	
1. Attitudes Toward Other Races	48	127.13	36.23	130.65	25.77	.69
2. Attitudes Toward Integration	47	94.60	9.50	100.81	12.44	4.16**
3. Attitudes Toward Children	48	89.08	8.71	91.06	7.84	1.65*
4. Knowledge of Curriculum	48	8.69	2.63	8.92	2.73	.73
5. External Control	48	7.58	3.77	7.77	3.90	.41

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level

TABLE 3

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t TESTS

OF 5 VARIABLES FOR WHITES

VARIABLE	N	JULY, 1969		MAY, 1970		t
		MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	
1. Attitudes Toward Other Races	33	139.12	14.43	135.94	32.36	.58
2. Attitudes Toward Integration	33	83.09	11.85	87.27	12.47	1.93*
3. Attitudes Toward Children	33	92.94	7.44	91.51	7.16	.99
4. Knowledge of Curriculum	33	8.58	2.48	9.15	2.62	1.68*
5. External Control	33	6.76	3.37	8.27	3.69	2.51**

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level

TABLE 4

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t TESTS

OF 5 VARIABLES FOR FEMALES

VARIABLE	N	JULY, 1969		MAY, 1970		t
		MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	
1. Attitudes Toward Other Races	53	127.00	32.79	131.02	27.09	.85
2. Attitudes Toward Integration	52	88.40	12.14	94.92	15.09	4.14**
3. Attitudes Toward Children	53	90.42	8.60	91.72	7.44	1.14
4. Knowledge of Curriculum	53	8.45	2.49	8.81	2.62	1.38
5. External Control	53	8.00	3.55	8.45	3.69	1.05

** Significant at the .01 level

TABLE 5

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t TESTS

OF 5 VARIABLES FOR MALES

VARIABLE	N	JULY, 1969		MAY, 1970		t
		MEANS	SD	MEAN	SD	
1. Attitudes Toward Other Races	28	141.50	20.54	136.18	31.41	.89
2. Attitudes Toward Integration	28	92.54	11.19	95.79	12.19	1.60
3. Attitudes Toward Children	28	91.11	8.10	90.36	7.75	.46
4. Knowledge of Curriculum	28	9.00	2.69	9.39	2.78	.85
5. External Control	28	5.82	3.35	7.07	3.92	1.77*

TABLE 6

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t TESTS

OF 5 VARIABLES FOR NEGRO FEMALES

VARIABLE	N	JULY, 1969		MAY, 1970		t
		MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	
1. Attitudes Toward Other Races	32	120.63	39.10	127.16	26.50	.94
2. Attitudes Toward Integration	31	93.52	10.06	100.10	14.03	3.33**
3. Attitudes Toward Children	32	89.31	9.07	91.63	7.81	1.55
4. Knowledge of Curriculum	32	8.41	2.59	8.88	2.64	1.26
5. External Control	32	8.31	3.74	8.31	3.72	.00

** Significant at .01 level

TABLE 7

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t TESTS

OF 5 VARIABLES FOR NEGRO MALES

VARIABLE	N	JULY, 1969		MAY, 1970		t
		MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	
1. Attitudes Toward Other Races	16	140.13	26.10	137.63	23.49	.40
2. Attitudes Toward Integration	16	96.69	8.20	102.19	8.80	2.50**
3. Attitudes Toward Children	16	88.63	8.20	89.94	8.02	.63
4. Knowledge of Curriculum	16	9.25	2.72	9.00	2.99	.44
5. External Control	16	6.12	3.48	6.69	4.14	.64

** Significant at .01 level

TABLE 8

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t TESTS

OF 5 VARIABLES FOR WHITE FEMALES

VARIABLE	N	JULY, 1969		MAY, 1970		t
		MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	
1. Attitudes Toward Other Races	21	136.71	16.18	136.90	27.55	.03
2. Attitudes Toward Integration	21	80.86	11.12	87.29	13.51	2.43**
3. Attitudes Toward Children	21	92.10	7.73	91.86	7.01	.14
4. Knowledge of Curriculum	21	8.52	2.38	8.71	2.65	.57
5. External Control	21	7.52	3.27	8.67	3.72	1.64*

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level

TABLE 9

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t TESTS

OF 5 VARIABLES FOR WHITE MALES

VARIABLE	N	JULY, 1969		MAY, 1970		t
		MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	
1. Attitudes Toward Other Races	12	143.33	9.98	134.25	40.76	.79
2. Attitudes Toward Integration	12	87.00	12.54	87.25	10.97	.07
3. Attitudes Toward Children	12	94.42	6.97	90.92	7.69	1.40
4. Knowledge of Curriculum	12	8.67	2.74	9.92	2.50	1.73*
5. External Control	12	5.41	3.26	7.58	3.70	1.89*

* Significant at .05 level

TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

VARIABLE	TOTAL GROUP	NEGROES	WHITES	FEMALES	MALES	NEGRO FEMALES	NEGRO MALES	WHITE FEMALES	WHITE MALES
Attitudes Toward Other Races									
Attitudes Toward Integration	**	**	*	**		**	**	**	
Attitudes Toward Children		*							
Knowledge of Curriculum			*						*
External Control	*		**		*			*	*